

**REMARKS**

The Examiner alleges that the Response filed on October 10, 2002 was not fully responsive to the prior Office Action because the Response refers to an election of species rather than an election between independent inventions.

The Examiner requested an election between independent inventions identified as follows:

- I. Claims 1-39, drawn to a cart, classified in class 280, subclass 47.19 or 79.2
- II. Claims 40-41, drawn to a method of distribution, classified in class 414, subclass 810 or 811

The Applicant hereby elects without traverse Invention I., specifically Claims 1-39, drawn to a cart, classified in class 280, subclass 47.19 or 79.2.

Applicant further wishes to clarify that the Preliminary Amendment filed on November 26, 2002, is directed to the elected Invention I., specifically Claims 1-39, drawn to a cart, classified in class 280, subclass 47.19 or 79.2. Applicant respectfully requests entry of new claims 42-108 of the Preliminary Amendment.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of this response, Applicant respectfully submits that each of the pending claims 1-39 and 42-108 are in condition for allowance. Therefore, reconsideration of the holding of incomplete responsiveness is requested and allowance of those claims is respectfully solicited. In the event that the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that could be clarified in a telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully invited to initiate the same with the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 4<sup>th</sup> day of March 2003.

Respectfully submitted,



JOHN C. STRINGHAM  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. «FormData»



**022913**

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE